APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,883	12/13/2000	Jeffrey A. Dean	0026-0006	5681

44989	7590	10/05/2006

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER
SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/734,883	DEAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34 and 3̶6̶-40* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34, 3̶6̶-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1)   This is a Non final rejection in response to arguments/remarks filed on 7/18/2006.

2)   Claims 1-34 and 37-40 are pending and rejected in this action. Applicant

canceled claims 35, 36.

3)   Effective filing date is 12/15/1999. Assignee is Google.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4)   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

7/18/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5)   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5-1)   Claims 39 and 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Pant et al (6012053, filed 6/1997).

Regarding independent claims 39 and 40, Pant teaches identifying a document that

is stored on the server in network that includes a plurality of links; determining a score

for each of a number of the links in the identified document based on a score of an

associated document pointed to by the link; modifying the identified document based on

the determined scores, where the modified document includes reordering the links

based on the score and providing the modified document to the user. For example,

Pant discloses search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where

each of the attributes are assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a

score for the item)(col 1, lines 50-63; col 2, lines 25-43; col 3, lines 30-55). Fig 7 shows

scores for each item which are the result of query where each item includes a hypertext

link to the source document and an indication of its score, as a function of the maximum

score of the retrieved item. The user cannot control the ranking and presentation of the

documents that are arranged from a most relevant link/document 1st and the least

important link/document at the bottom (col 13, lines 9-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6-1)   Claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 11, 13, 17, 18, 22 and 24-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kirsch</u> et al (US 6070158, filed Nov 1997), in

view of NonPatent Literature "WebWatcher: A Learning Apprentice for the World

Wide Web" (Robert Armstrong, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon

University, issued Feb 1, 1995, pages 1-7)(hereinafter "<u>WebWatcher</u>").

Regarding independent Claim 1, Kirsch teaches *identifying a document that is stored*

on a server in a network and that includes a plurality of entries and determine a score

for each of a number of the entries in the identified document based on a score of a

document associated with the entry. For example, Kirsch discloses a real time

document collection search engine with phrase indexing where a user query against a

collection of documents provides a search report, which contains document

identifications for the user's query and the relevancy score is determined for the

documents found and indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5).

The examiner equates the search report to the identified document.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *modifying the identified document based on the determined score; and providing the modified document to the user. For example, Webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks and highliting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user.* Specifically, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link (page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon to highlight the most relevant link as a recommendation as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding independent Claim 24, Kirsch teaches *determine a score for each of a number of the entries in the identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry.* For example, Kirsch discloses a real time document collection search engine with phrase indexing where a user query against a collection of documents provides a search report, which contains document identifications for the user's query and the relevancy score is determined for the documents found and indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5). The examiner equates the search report to the identified document.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *identifying a document based on an address associated with the identified document, where the identified document*

includes entries. Webwatcher discloses where a user invokes webwatcher with a URL,

which allows the user to fill out a form specifying the information seeking goal,

Webwatcher sends the user back a *copy of the original page* including in it, hyperlinks

on the page that are recommended by its search control knowledge (page 3, col 1,

bottom). The examiner equates the disclosed URL as equivalent to the address.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *modifying the identified document*

based on the determined score; and providing the modified document to the user. For

example, Webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks and highliting the most promising link

in order to suggest them to the user. Specifically, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the

highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the

link (page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with

an icon to highlight the most relevant link as a recommendation as taught by

Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by

employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target

information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding independent claims 25, 26, 28 and 31, Applicant argues is similar subject

matter as recited in claims 1 and 24, and thus are rejected under similar grounds for

rejection (see Remarks, page 22, fourth paragraph).

Regarding independent Claim 27, Kirsch teaches *determine a score for each of a*

number of the entries. For example, Kirsch discloses a real time document collection

search engine with phrase indexing where a user query against a collection of

documents provides a search report, which contains document identifications for the

user's query and the relevancy score is determined for the documents found and

indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5).   The examiner equates

the search report to the identified document.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches using a browser, *requesting documents*

stored on a server based on an address associated with the document one of the

requested document including entries. Webwatcher discloses where a user invokes

webwatcher with a URL (on the browser address field) which allows the user to fill out a

form specifying the information seeking goal, Webwatcher sends the user back a *copy*

of the original page including in it, hyperlinks on the page that are recommended by its

search control knowledge (page 3, col 1, bottom). The examiner equates the disclose

URL as equivalent to the address. The instructions are provided by the user on the

browser to return back an electronic page with the most relevant entries from a list of

entries. In order to support this functionality, the browser must have the functionality to

support the user's instructions and execute on them in order to return a document with

documents with scored hyperlinks with the most relevant one highlighted.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *modifying the identified document*

based on the determined score; and presenting the modified document. For example,

Webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks and highliting the most promising link in order

to suggest them to the user. Specifically, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the

highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the

link (page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with

an icon to highlight the most relevant link as a recommendation as taught by

Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by

employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target

information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding independent Claim 33, Kirsch teaches *receiving a document from the*

second server, the document including one or more entries and determining a score for

a number or entries. For example, Kirsch discloses a real time document collection

search engine with phrase indexing where a user query against a collection of

documents provides a search report, which contains document identifications for the

user's query and the relevancy score is determined for the documents found and

indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5). The examiner equates

the search report to the identified document.

Kirsch discloses sending the documents from one server to the other. For example,

Kirsch discloses a document server on the internet (Fig 1, item 18) that communicates

with various search sites (fig 1, item 16). The various search sites are the first server

and the document server (item) is the second server because it holds the documents.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *modifying the identified document*

based on the determined score; and sending the document. For example, Webwatcher,

upon identifying hyperlinks and highliting the most promising link in order to suggest

them to the user. Specifically, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link

with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link (page 3, left

column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with

an icon to highlight the most relevant link as a recommendation as taught by

Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by

employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target

information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding independent Claim 37, Kirsch teaches *receiving an input from a user and*

requesting a document based on the input, the document including a plurality of links.

For example, Kirsch discloses a real time document collection search engine with

phrase indexing where a user query against a collection of documents provides a

search report, which contains document identifications for the user's query (equivalent

to the user's input) and the relevancy score is determined for the documents found and

indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5). The examiner equates

the search report to the identified document.

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *a browser assistant to intercept the*

document, parse the document to identify the links in the document, modify the

document based on the determined scores, present the modified document to the user.

Webwatcher servers as an assistant to the browser because when a user at a browser

invokes webwatcher with a URL which allows the user to fill out a form specifying the information seeking goal, Webwatcher sends the user back a *copy of the original page* including in it, hyperlinks on the page that are recommended by its search control knowledge (page 3, col 1, bottom). Specifically, after submission of the sought query by the user and prior to the return of results to the user, webwatcher "assists" the user as they follow hyperlinks forwarded through the web in search of the target information, and adds a highlighting mark to highlight the links on the user's display (section 2). The examiner interprets web watcher as a browser assistant because the control of invoking or dismissing webwatcher is with the user and webwatcher follows the user through various pages thus showing loyalty to the user's search rather than being attached to a particular page on the server. With the broadest reasonable interpretation, a browser assistant is can operation at any location (ie., assist the browser via a network from a server). Specifically, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link (page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon to highlight the most relevant link as a recommendation as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 2, Kirsch teaches web document (ie., web document)(col 1, line 45).

Regarding Claim 4, Kirsch teaches intercepting ... client (ie., Fig 1, item 16 shows the

search the search site input data from the server 18 and outputs to client.

Regarding Claim 5, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries

... to the link (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page based on

the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

Regarding Claim 6, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries

... identified document (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page

based on the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link that

refers to a further page as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users

locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are

likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 11, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57);

Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a

relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);

Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their

corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

Regarding Claim 13, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57);

Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a

relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);

Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

Regarding Claim 17, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches "visually distinguishing the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link)(page 3, upper left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 18, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches visually distinguishing ... determined scores (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link and highlighting the most promising links)(page 3, upper and lower left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 22, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches annotating the entries based on the scores (ie., highlighting the most promising links to the user and adding the eyes icon)(Fig 4, page 3, upper left corner).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, page 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 29, Kirsch teaches identifying the entries in the document (ie., search engine to identify a predetermined document)(col 3, line 65-col 4, line 5);

Sending the identified entries to a server (ie., the search service reference the document by a document server which sends the result to the Internet, presumable thru the internet server)(col 5, lines 15-23);

Receiving, from the server, scores for the identified entries (ie., the requesting client receives the results with scores via the internet and displays to the user)(see Fig 1, items 14, 16, 18; col 5, lines 15-23).

Regarding Claim 30, Kirsch teaches sending the document to a server (ie., with a distribute database server within the search site, the document server 18 gets the document, adds the highlights or other identifiers and sends the result to the client)(col 7, lines 30-35; col 5, lines 15-23).

6-2)   Claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kirsch</u> et al (as cited above), in view of <u>WebWatcher</u> (as cited above), further in view of <u>Pant</u> et al (US 6012053, filed Jun 23, 1997).

Regarding Claim 3, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach but Pant teaches non-web document (col 1, lines 32-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include non-web documents as

taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie.,

records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the

search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claims 12 and 14, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant

teaches for each of the linked documents, comparing the query with the contents of the

linked document, and determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of

match between the query and the contents of the linked document (ie., search query

ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are

assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item)(col 1,

lines 50-63; col 2, lines 25-43; col 3, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked

according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned

a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by

Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records,

text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has

in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 15, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches

"reordering the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort

search result according to the relevant scores)(col 2, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include sorting module to sort

search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of

a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which

include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines

32-35).

Regarding Claim 16, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches

"sorting the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort search

result according to the relevant scores) (col 2, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a sorting module to sort

search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of

a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which

include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines

32-35).

Regarding Claim 20, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches

"moving one or more of the entries with a score above a threshold to a prominent

location's in the identified document" (ie., user selects relevance factors and the

presentation of results differs)(col 13, lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked according to

user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and

the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by Pant, providing

the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents,

etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant,

col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 23, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches

"adding at least one of scores, rating symbols, and document information to the entries

based on the determined scores" (ie., percentage as score)(col 2, lines 35-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a percentage as score as

taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie.,

records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the

search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**6-3)   Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in
view of Page (US 6285999, filed Jan 9, 1998).**

Regarding Claim 7, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches

"for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking

documents that contain links to the linked documents," "determining scores for each of

the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents,"

"associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding

entries in the identified documents" (col 3, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include provide for scoring linked database documents as taught by Page, providing the motivation to determine the importance of a document (Page, col 3, lines 20-25).

Regarding Claim 8, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches determining the clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents based on determined clickthrough rates and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the document. The examiner interprets the user of clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how important that document is. For example, Page discloses node ranking in a linked database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of providing an objective ranking based on the relationship between documents (col 2, lines 40-45).

Regarding Claim 9, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches "determining a popularity of each of the linked documents," "determining scores for each

of the linked documents based on the determined popularity," "associating the

determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the

identified documents" (ie., importance of a document if highly cited by other

documents... rank assigned to it ... providing a score linked database documents) (col

2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 5-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance,

scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing

the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by

counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

Regarding Claim 10, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches

"for each of the linked documents, determining a popularity of a web site containing the

linked document," "associating the popularity of the web site to the linked document"

(ie., importance of a document if highly cited by other documents... rank assigned to it

... providing a score linked database documents) (col 2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance,

scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing

the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by

counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

6-4)   Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Brown et al. (US Patent 6635838, filed Jul 30, 1999).

Regard to dependent claim 19, Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "changing at least one of a font, style, size, or color of the entries provided to the user" (ie., bolding, color, text size, font, italic, shading on text)(Brown, col 7, line 55 – col 8, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include alteration of text to highlight the query text/data as taught in Brown, providing the benefit for internet users to have a tool to enable them to make more informed decisions about which links to follow and improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-20).

Regard to dependent claim 21, Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "deleting one or more of the entries with scores below a predetermined threshold" (ie., if below threshold, not displaying one of the prefetched entries)(col 10, lines 25-60; fig 12, items 1205-1260).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include removing an entry from a final display or a prefetched list if the threshold is not met, as taught in Brown, providing the benefit of an internet tool to enable users to make more informed decision about which link to follow, and dramatically improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-18).

6-5)   Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kirsch</u> et al (as cited above).

Regarding Claims 32 and 34, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instruction (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4).

Kirsch does not teach a processor configured to execute ... the one second server, but does teach a document server attached to the multiple databases servers distributed within search site, and a skilled artisan would consider these distributed servers as equivalent to the second server as claimed (ie., to determined score for the entries from a predetermined document from a collection of documents)(col 4, lines 1-5; col 7, line 35). Additionally, Kirsch discloses a document server on the internet (Fig 1, item 18) that communicates with various search sites (fig 1, item 16). The various search sites are the first server and the document server (item) is the second server because it holds the documents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include the distributed database servers working in conjunction with a document server to determine the score for providing search query results as suggested by Kirsch, providing the benefit of real-time document indexes that can be distributed over a number of collection index servers to service search queries from a client (col 3, lines 52-57).

6-6)   Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li

(US 5920859, issued 7/6/1999) in view of "Previous Work" by Mike Perkowitz

(1999-03-02, available at <http://www8.org/w8-papers/2b-

customizing/towards/node3.html>)(hereinafter "Perkowitz").

Regarding independent claim 38, Li teaches a score for the links in the document

based on a score associated document pointed to by the link. For example, Li discloses

a hypertext document retrieval method obtains a relevance ranking for each hyperlink

and provides a relevance ranking for each hyperlink pointing to a particular document in

order to determine a score for the document (col 4, lines 20-25; Abstract).

Li does not teach but Perkowitz teaches the client identifying a document that is

stored on the server in a network that includes plurality of links, modifying, by the client

device, the identified document based on the determined scores and providing, by the

client device, the modified document to the user. For example, Perkowitz discloses the

AiA project for client-side customization in which a user has her own associated agent

who learns about her interests and customizes her web experience accordingly by

adding a presentation agent who directs the user's attention to the topic of interest and

decides what to highlight and present it to the user on the client side (page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Li to include client-side customization in which a user has her own

associated agent who learns about her interests and customizes her web experience

accordingly by adding a presentation agent who directs the user's attention to the topic

of interest and decides what to highlight and present it to the user on the client side as

taught by Perkowitz, providing the benefit of allowing a user to customize the site for

themselves including favorite links that are relevant to the user (Perkowitz, page 1, 1st

paragraph).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Note: Applicant's reference to the Armstrong reference is equivalent to the

examiner's reference to the cited Webwatcher nonpatent literature (Armostrong is the

name of one of the authors of the Webwatcher article cited above).

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicant argues that neither Kirsch nor

Armstrong discloses or suggests determining a score for each of a number of the

entries in an identified document, stored in a network, based on a score of a document

associated with the entry (pages 16-20). The examiner disagrees. Kirsch discloses a

real time document collection search engine with phrase indexing where a user query

against a collection of documents provides a search report, which contains document

identifications for the user's query and the relevancy score is determined for each

documents found and indexed in the search report in an effort to provide the user with

the most relevant document (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-13). Additionally, the

Webwatcher reference, authored by Armstrong discloses recommending hyperlink (to

another document) and in order to determine which one to recommend, the

Webwatcher process my score each of the hyperlinks, although they only highlight the

most recommended hyperlink. Kirsch, in column 5, line 41-42 specifically provides a "relevancy score for each of the documents".

Regarding claim 24, Applicant argues that Kirsch and Armstrong do not teach determine a score for each of a number of the entries in the identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry (Remarks, pages 20-22). The examiner disagrees. Kirsch discloses a real time document collection search engine with phrase indexing where a user query against a collection of documents provides a search report, which contains document identifications for the user's query and the relevancy score is determined for the documents found and indexed in the search report (col 5, lines 35-48; col 4, lines 1-5). The examiner equates the search report to the identified document. Webwatcher discloses where a user invokes webwatcher with a URL, which allows the user to fill out a form specifying the information seeking goal, Webwatcher sends the user back a *copy of the original page* including in it, hyperlinks on the page that are recommended by its search control knowledge (page 3, col 1, bottom). The examiner equates the discloses URL as equivalent to the address.

Regarding independent claims 25, 26, 28 and 31, Applicant argues is similar subject matter as recited in claims 1 and 24, and are thus rejected under similar grounds for rejection. At most, Applicant argues that claims 25, 26, 28 and 31 are distinguishable from Kirsch and Armstrong for similar reasons given for arguments regarding claims 1 and 24. Thus examiner asserts a response similar to claims 1 and 24.

Regarding independent claim 27, the Applicant argues that Kirsch and Armstrong do not teach a web browser that includes instructions for determining scores for each of a number of entries (Remarks, pages 22-24). The examine disagrees. Webwatcher discloses where a user invokes webwatcher with a URL (on the browser address field) which allows the user to fill out a form specifying the information seeking goal, Webwatcher sends the user back a *copy of the original page* including in it, hyperlinks on the page that are recommended by its search control knowledge (page 3, col 1, bottom). The examiner equates the disclose URL as equivalent to the address. The instructions are provided by the user on the browser to return back an electronic page with the most relevant entries from a list of entries. In order to support this functionality, the browser must have the functionality to support the user's instructions and execute on them in order to return a document with documents with scored hyperlinks with the most relevant one highlighted.

Regarding independent claim 33, the Applicant argues that Kirsch and Armstrong do not discloses sending the documents from one server to the other (Remarks, page 25). The examiner disagrees. Kirsch discloses a document server on the internet (Fig 1, item 18) that communicates with various search sites (fig 1, item 16). The various search sites are the first server and the document server is the second server because it holds the documents. Distributed document servers for document retrievals were very well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claims 3, 12, 14-16, 20 and 23, the applicant argues that Pant does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosure of Kirsch and Armstrong with regard to claim

1 (see Remarks, page 26). The examiner disagrees. For the limitations of Claim 1, see

examiner's rejection and response above. For the limitations of claims 3, 12, 14-26, 20

and 23, Pant discloses a computer system with user controlled relevance ranking of

search results to provide the user with an indication of items in the search results in an

order ranked according to relevance of each item, which is equivalent to limitations

presented in claims 3, 12 14-16, 20 and 23. The examiner disagrees. Pant teaches

non-web document (col 1, lines 32-35)

Regarding claims 7, 9 and 10, Applicant argues that Kirsch in view of Armstrong

and Page does not teach the limitations of the claims because there is no motivation to

combine the Page with Kirsch and Armstrong (remarks, pages 26-29). The rank

assigned to a document is based on the rank of the documents citing that document.

Page scores and ranks linked documents based on the documents it is linked with

which is equivalent to the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to

combine the teachings of Page with Kirsch and Armstrong because all references deal

with scoring and ranking of links in a linked document environment.

Regarding claim 8, Applicant argues that the references do not teach

clickthrough rate. The examiner introduces a new line of rejection under Kirsch in view

of Webwatcher in view of Page. Specifically, The examiner interprets the user of

clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many

hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how

important that document is. To teach this, Page discloses node ranking in a linked

database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank

is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

Regarding independent claims 32 and 34, Applicant argues that the references do not teach the plurality of servers (pages 33-35). The examiner disagrees. Kirsch discloses a document server on the internet (Fig 1, item 18) that communicates with various search sites (fig 1, item 16). The various search sites are the first server and the document server (item) is the second server because it holds the documents. Distributed document servers for document retrievals were very well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding independent claim 37, Applicant argues that Ballard in view of Armstrong does not teach the claimed invention (Remarks, page 35-37). The examiner withdraws the primary reference, Ballard and asserts a new ground of rejection under Kirsch in view of Armstrong.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GS 9/29/06

GS

Heather R. Herndon
Supervisor Heather R. Herndon
Te.Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100